IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.H.L.DATTU
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.T.SANKARAN

FRIDAY, THE 27TH JULY 2007 / 5TH SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 23091 of 2007(S)

PETITIONER:

ADV. KATTAKADA CHRISTOPHER,
AGED 60 YEARS, S/O. J. GEORGE,
RESIDING AT BETHESDA,
CHOONDUPALAKA JUNCTION,
KATTAKADA P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,
PIN-695 572.

BY ADV. SRI.KOSHY GEORGE

RESPONDENTS:
---

1. UNION OF INDIA, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS,
NEW DELHI.

2. STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT, FOREST AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIATE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS (WILD LIFE),
VAZHUTHAKADU, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

4. WILD LIFE WARDEN, TRIVANDRUM DIVISION,
P.T.P. NAGAR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI C.T.RAVIKUMAR.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 27/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

H.L. DATTU, C.J. & K.T. SANKARAN, J.

W.P.(C) No.23091 OF 2007

Dated, this the 27th day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

H.L. DATTU, CJ.

Petitioner is a practising lawyer and also a public spirited citizen.

2. A lengthy petition is filed. Assertions and allegations are made against the respondents. To support those assertions and allegations, no material is produced before this court.

3. A petition of this nature, in our opinion, cannot be entertained by us in view of the observations made by the Supreme Court in the case of *Kushum Lata v. Union of India and others - (2006) 6 SCC 180.* In the said decision the court has observed as under:

> "As noted above, such petitions do not provide any basis for verifying the correctness of statements made and information given in the petition. It would be desirable for the courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as aforestated so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the courts."

4. In our opinion, the observations made by the Supreme Court in the aforesaid decision would squarely apply to the petition filed by the petitioner before us. In that view of the matter none of the reliefs sought

for in this petition can be granted. Accordingly, this petition requires to be rejected and it is rejected. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to approach this court again, if need arises in future.

H.L. DATTU,
CHIEF JUSTICE.

K.T. SANKARAN,
JUDGE.

mt/